

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The following remarks are submitted in response to the Advisory Action dated March 10, 2009. Claims 1-10 and 21 are canceled without prejudice as to resubmission. Claim 14 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 10. Claims 11-13, 16 and 18 have been amended to correct claim dependency. Claims 16 and 18 have also been amended to remove redundant claim limitations. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 11-20 will be pending in the application. No new matter has been added.

1. *Interview Summary*

In accordance with 37 CFR §1.133 and MPEP §713.04, the following is a summary of the interviews conducted on February 17, 2009 and April 6, 2009 in response to the Final Office Action dated December 18, 2008 and Advisory Action dated March 10, 2009.

The undersigned, on behalf of Applicant Limin Mu, conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Imani Hayman on February 17, 2009 regarding U.S. Patent Application No. 10/595,825, addressing the rejection of claims 10, 11, 14 and 21 over U.S. Patent No. 6,902,543 (hereinafter “Cherif-Cheikh”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,776,775 (hereinafter “Mohammad”).

During the interview, the undersigned presented arguments in favor of patentability of claims 10, 11, 14 and 21 pointing out the deficiencies of Cherif-Cheikh and Mohammad. All the arguments presented in the interview were subsequently expressed in writing in the Office Action response dated February 18, 2009. The Examiner indicated that the missing elements pointed-out by the undersigned may render the claims allowable but further consideration would be required. No agreement was reached, and no other pertinent matters were addressed during the interview.

The undersigned also conducted a subsequent telephonic interview with Supervisor Kevin Sirmons on April 6, 2009 regarding U.S. Patent Application No. 10/595,825, addressing the rejection of claims 11 and 14 over Cherif-Cheikh in view of Mohammad. Specifically, the undersigned noted that Cherif-Cheikh did not disclose a separate inner sleeve as required by claim 11. Additionally, neither Cherif-Cheikh nor Mohammad disclosed buckles positioned on

the plunger sleeve or two tongues and two slots arranged on the plunger sleeve as required by claim 14.

Following the April 6, 2009 interview, Examiner Hayman notified the undersigned by phone that claim 14 would be allowable if presented in independent form.

2. *Allowable Subject Matter*

On April 6, 2008, the Examiner notified the Applicant that claim 14 contains allowable subject matter. Pursuant to the Examiner's request, claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form by incorporating the limitations of previous claim 10. Applicant therefore respectfully requests issuance of a notice of allowance in view of the claim amendments made herein.

3. *Conclusion*

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner Hayman feels that a telephone interview would expedite prosecution of this patent application, he is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned at 215-599-0600. Contact with the undersigned via electronic mail at gdoe@patentwise.com is hereby authorized¹ per MPEP 502.03.

Respectfully submitted,

/Grace S. Doe/

Grace Doe
Registration No. 59,257

Date: April 16, 2009

KNOBLE YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY, LLC
Eight Penn Center- Suite 1350
1628 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 599-0600 Main
(215) 599-0601 Fax
gdoe@patentwise.com

¹ Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.